

Research Abstracts

1 Scholarly Tracks: Not Just for Academic Careers

DeFazio C, Lindstrom H, Canavan J / University at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

Background: Scholarly tracks are effective tools for developing residents’ academic skills and preparing them for a career in academia. Scholarly tracks’ impact is less well understood on those pursuing careers in community settings.

Objectives: Explore scholarly tracks’ impact on residents’ employment and career paths.

Methods: The University at Buffalo EM (UBEM) residency program director emailed 2012-2018 program graduates and invited them to participate in an anonymous 9 item Google survey.

Results: Of the 83 graduates contacted, 57 responses (69%) were received. The most frequently completed scholarly tracks were ultrasound (43.9%) and EMS (24.6%). Respondents agreed scholarly tracks added value to their working skill set (96.5%), and 80.7% reported using the skills in their current job. Respondents were asked about (52.6%) and brought up scholarly track experience to gain a competitive advantage (66.7%) during job interviews. Nearly half (49.1%) reported potential employers implied scholarly tracks added value to their job candidacy. Half (52.6%) felt their scholarly track gave them an advantage securing their first job. A majority (62.5%) obtained a first job in a non-academic, community setting. Responses were compared for those in community vs. academic jobs. Almost all community respondents (97.1%) and academic respondents (95.2%) reported scholarly tracks added value to their working skill set, and they were using the skills (community: 77.1%; academic: 85.7%). Those respondents whose first job was in an academic setting were more likely to perceive that their scholarly track experience gave them an advantage in securing their job (71.4%) vs. those in a community setting (40.0%).

Conclusions: Survey respondents who graduated from the UBEM Residency program reported scholarly track experiences added value to their working skill sets. Respondents were asked about and discussed their scholarly track experience during job interviews, and nearly half reported they perceived the tracks added value to their candidacy. While the perceived value of scholarly tracks appeared to be more evident in an academic setting, there is still perceived value for graduates heading into the community setting.

Scholarly Track Completed (Total N=57)	n (%)
Academic	5 (8.8)
Administration	6 (10.5)
EMS	14 (24.6)
Pediatric EM	1 (1.8)
Public Health	6 (10.5)
Ultrasound	25 (43.9)

Question	Graduates 2012-2018	Combined Categories: First Job (Total N=56)*	
	All Respondents N = 57	Academic N=21	Community N=35
	Yes n (%)	Yes n (%)	Yes n (%)
Do you feel your scholarly track experience during residency added value to your current working skillset?	55 (96.5)	20 (95.2)	34 (97.1)
Are you using the skills attained from your scholarly track experience in your current job?	46 (80.7)	18 (85.7)	27 (77.1)
Did any potential employers ask you about your scholarly track experience during the interview process?	30 (52.6)	14 (66.7)	15(42.9)
Did you bring up your scholarly track experience during the interview process to try to gain a competitive advantage ?	38 (66.7)	15 (71.4)	22 (62.9)
Did potential employers imply that the scholarly track experience added value to your candidacy for the job ?	28 (49.1)	13 (61.9)	14 (40.0)
Do you feel that your scholarly track experience gave you an advantage in securing the job you did?	30 (52.6)	15(71.4)	14 (40.0)
Do you feel that your scholarly track experience gave you an advantage in securing the job that you wanted most?	27 (47.4)	15 (71.4)	11 (31.4)

* One respondent did not indicate academic vs. community setting

2 The Anticipated Negative Impact On Emergency Medicine Faculty Of The New ACGME Common Program Requirements

Quinn S, Kane B, Goyke T, Yenser D, Greenberg M, Barr JR, G / Lehigh Valley Health Network, University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Background: EM residencies are regulated by Program Requirements from the EM RRC. These must comply with the Common Program Requirements (CPR) established by the ACGME. In 2018, the ACGME issued new CPR that altered the definitions for core faculty.

Objectives: To determine, via EM faculty perceptions, the impact of the new CPR on their well-being and job satisfaction. The faculty were asked to anticipate the impact on the educational experience of residents.

Methods: A 7-question electronic survey was iteratively developed. After CORD approval, it was distributed using the listserv. Responses were either dichotomous (Yes/NO) or on a 1 (No Impact) to 10 (Maximum Negative Impact) Likert scale and were analyzed descriptively. A single open-ended question was analyzed qualitatively.

Results: There were 212 responses. Program Directors (79) and their Associates/Assistants (81) were the majority. Core